Then in 1989, something happened. In 1989, the rate of increase for public expenditures went to its highest level—11.9 percent; private levels going up at 10.3 percent. Then, in 1990, public expenditures went up 13.2 percent; for the second year in a row, public expenditures went up faster than private, a trend that has continued to this day unabated.

In 1991, public expenditures are still up in the double digits—12.6 percent, but market forces are beginning to assert themselves in the private market-place, and the private expenditures only increased 5.6 percent. It did not stay down that low the next year. They came up to 6.9; but public expenditures stayed in double digits at 10.8 percent.

Now they have been getting better. In 1993, public expenditures 8.5, but private is 7.2. In 1994, public expenditures come down to 7.8; but private drops to 5.3 percent.

For the minority leader to say that the reason we cannot do something about the expanding growth of Medicare is because Medicare expenditures are going up at the same rate as private expenditures, is to ignore the facts of the case.

Private expenditures are coming down in terms of the percentage growth at a faster rate than public expenditures are coming down. Indeed, Madam President, if we were to take the minority leader's statement at face value, where he says:

Medicare Program costs are increasing because all health care insurance costs are increasing on a per capita basis. Medicare and Medicare costs are increasing at the same rate as privately insured costs.

If that statement were true, that would mean that Medicare and Medicaid costs would be increasing at 5.3 percent per year, which figure, Madam President, is within the band the Budget Committee is considering for increases for Medicare and Medicaid.

I have sat in on the budget briefing and I have heard the budgeteers say, "If only we could get the rate of increase down to 5 percent, we could solve all of our problems." The rate of increase is down to 5 percent in private expenditures.

The minority leader thinks the two are the same. Perhaps he has them confused and thinks that the private people have not done a good enough job and the private expenditures are up in this kind of level for public expenditures. In fact, they are not. They have, ever since 1989, come down at a faster rate than the public expenditures come down and they are leading the way.

This is the point we need to keep in mind, then, Madam President, with respect to Medicare and the reforms that are necessary. We cannot demagog this issue. We must stick with the facts. Our goal is to make the system that takes care of our elderly as stable, as secure, and as certain for the future as the system that takes care of the rest of the population.

If we can do it as responsible public servants at the same rate of increase

that exists in the rest of the population, we can solve all of our budgetary problems and the disastrous circumstance indicated in this table will go away.

Madam President, I have nothing but respect for our distinguished minority leader. I consider him a friend and one of the more reasonable and certainly most thoughtful Members of this body. I feel that the information that he shared with the Senate last night is inaccurate, and it becomes Members in this debate to make sure that the record is set straight as quickly as possible, because the stakes in this debate are so high.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT No. 1.

CBO estimates for total medical and health care spending in the public and private sector from 1985 until 1994. The figures include spending for administrative costs, construction, and research and development as well as personal health care costs associated with doctors and hospitals. The figures shown represent a percentage increase over the previous year's spending level.

MEDICAL EXPENDITURES

Year	Public (percent)	Private (percent
985	8.8	10.3
986	8.9	6.1
987	8.9	8.5
988	9.0	12.6
989	11.9	10.3
990	13.2	10.6
991	12.6	5.6
992	10.8	6.9
993	8.5	7.2
994	7.8	5.3

Source: CRS.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah is recognized. Mr. HATCH. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. HATCH and Mr. PRYOR, pertaining to the introduction of S. 758 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I see no other Senator seeking recognition at this time. Therefore, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGARDING A PRIVATE VISIT BY PRESIDENT LEE TENG-HUI, OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON TAIWAN, TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 53, expressing the sense of Congress regarding a private visit by the President of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the United States.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I am sorry I have to do this, but in behalf of another Senator who could not be here at this time, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Chair.

THE SENATE CHAMBER DESKS—A BRIEF HISTORY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, recently I announced that I was not going to be seeking another term in the Senate. It has been a wonderful opportunity these last 16½ years to serve in this great body, to be serving with all of my great colleagues and friends from all the 50 States, and all the wonderful staff people that make this place run. I just want to thank all of them so much for their many kindnesses shown to me.

Mr. President, I was cleaning out my desk a while ago and just looking through something I have had in my desk for some time that was prepared by some of the individuals, I think, in the Historian's office. That is not the proper name for those who prepared this. But I thought while there were interested parties involved, I might read a few pages of some of the history of the desks in this Chamber. This is a brief history.

When British troops burned the U.S. Capitol in 1814 during the War of 1812, they severely damaged the Senate Chamber and destroyed the original furnishings. The rebuilt Chamber was completed in 1819 and the Senate ordered 48 new desks at a cost of \$34 each from Thomas Constantine. A New York cabinetmaker, he also constructed desks for the House of Representatives. Many of these early desks remain in use in the Senate Chamber today. As new states have entered the Union over the years, additional desks of identical design have been built and placed in use.

Throughout most of the 19th century a senator's only office was his desk on the Senate floor,

We did not have, I might say, the Senate office buildings. This was our office, the desk that was on the Senate floor.

but gradually separate rooms were assigned. The earliest offices were Committee rooms occupied by their chairmen; additional space later became available under the Olmsted Terraces on the West Front of the Capitol. Finally, with the completion of the first Senate office building [the Russell Building] in 1909, all senators were able to occupy suitable offices on Capitol Hill.

Over the years, modifications have been made to the Chamber desks to provide more room for books and papers. Beginning in the